VISIT US ONLINE: https://revistas.ucr.ac.cr/index.php/rbt

PRIVATE INFORMATION						
Manuscript title:						
Reviewer's name: Affiliation, country and E-mail address:						
Date:						
Please mark one:						
Do you want to appear in the yearly list of reviewers published each March? YES, NO						
Note: Send this form in editable text format so that we copy and paste the pertinent parts that we send to authors, while keeping your anonymity.						
Type of articles that we publish: we strive to publish scientific papers based on solid methods (strong experimental design, enough field work), in subjects of general and lasting interest. All theoretical and applied fields of biology are within our scope, as long as the ecosystems, or the organisms, are tropical.						
What we do not consider: we cannot publish studies that only add details or cases to previously known phenomena, checklists, range extensions, new records, short communications, notes, preliminary studies, and highly specialized technical reports of limited interest. Descriptions of single species are not accepted, but exceptions can be made for new vertebrate species.						
To conserve your anonymity: if you make annotations in the attached Word document, please verify that your name or initials do not show in the annotations.						
Ethics: The journal publishes only original work based on appropriate scientific procedures and ask authors to follow local legislation and general ethical principles: please let us know if you find any cases of error, citation manipulation, piracy, plagiarism, duplicate submission, republication, fabrication or falsification of data, or ethical flaws of any kind. We also encourage authors to publish raw data and data logs in public repositories and to include the links, but this is not compulsory at the moment.						
We follow the golden rule ("review for others as you would like others to review for you") and will be particularly thankful for fair and concrete recommendations that help authors improve the manuscript.						
COMMENTS FOR EDITOR ONLY						
1. For this particular manuscript (please check), is the journal appropriate?						
Yes						
No □						
If not, please tell us why and suggest another journal:						
2. The scientific value of the information, <u>independently of manuscript format</u> , is: Excellent □						
Good D						
Regular Details The state of the state o						
Bad						
3. <u>Based on content,</u> my overall scoring (1-10 / i.e., 10 is the highest score) for this manuscript is						
4. In general terms, the manuscript is:						
Acceptable with minor improvements						
Acceptable with intermediate changes						
Unacceptable unless completely rewritten □						

COMMENTS FOR THE EDITOR ONLY

COMMENTS FOR AUTHORS

Please send your comments directly to this email address, and in the subject heading include "Review of", a few words from the manuscript title and the name of the first author. Please mention in your reply if you want a certificate stating that you acted as a reviewer for the journal.

OPTIONAL EVALUATION FORM

If you wish, you can additionally fill this form or use it to guide your review. Thank you

1.	Is the title brief and prop Yes \square	perly describes the content \square	nts?			
2.	Is the Abstract a sufficient Yes □	ently informative summary of the main aspects? No \Box				
3.	Will the key words allow proper retrieval of the information in data-bases and Internet (www)? Yes \square No \square					
4.	Is the first part an updat Yes \square	ed and interesting introdu No □	action to the subject?			
5.	Is the Material and Methods section correct and the study can be repeated or reinterpreted of the basis of the information it contains? Yes \square No \square					
6.	Are the quality and organical Yes \square	nization of illustrations a No \square	and tables satisfactory?			
7.	Were quantitative data a Yes □	appropriately tested with	statistical methods? Does not apply □			
8.	Are the results reasonab Yes \square	le? No □				
9.	Is the discussion correct and circumscribed to the information presented? Yes \Box No \Box					
10.	Are the conclusions was Yes \square	ranted considering meth No □	ods and results?			
11.	Are all the references up Yes \square	odated and pertinent, and No \square	cited in the text?			
12.	Are the organization and Yes \square	d grammar satisfactory? No □	Explain:			
13.	Is the length of the man $Yes \square$	uscript adequate? No □				
14.	Were ethical guide-lines Yes □		as and other animals followed? Does not apply \square			